



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

After an interval Paul chooses Silas and starts on his second journey, beginning with the Cilician churches and going on into Galatia, publishing the Decree, but showing how the rule of love leads one to do "all things to save some" by circumcising Timothy to establish good feeling. 50 ff.

What suppositions does this involve?

Peter's visit to Antioch in Gal. 2:10 is not in chronological order.

The Antioch gift and Cornelius incident of Acts, chap. 11, are not in the proper historical setting.

The Acts account of the Council at Jerusalem is a confusion of a private conference and a public hearing shortly afterward at which Paul and Barnabas were probably not present.

What questions does the later date of Galatians leave unsettled which the earlier date settles?

1. Why does Paul omit the trip to Jerusalem with the Antioch gift?

2. Why does not Paul mention the Apostolic Decree?

3. Why does not Paul defend the circumcision of Timothy?

4. Why is there no mention of Timothy or Silas?

These questions are absolutely unanswerable if Galatians were written after the second journey, and either Paul or Acts must be discredited. If Paul is to be discredited here, how can we tell what is to be regarded as dependable? If Acts is to be discredited here, then it is useless to try to determine any chronology upon its data. Is it not better to seek an explanation which may seem possible, notwithstanding the fact that there is no method of decisive demonstration?

FAITH: NEW AND OLD

SEAL THOMPSON, A.M.

Ogontz, Pennsylvania

I

Faith, some men say, is out of fashion; science has pre-empted the field. Science transacts the business of the world—naturally, for science has ample qualifications for the task. Science has shop windows, on which are emblazoned, as on the Chinese signboards, "No cheating here"; science can display its wares with valid assur-

ance that the goods will be delivered; science can enter upon the day's work without temerity, for by set of sun a definite "so much" will be accomplished; science can guarantee prompt service; science can anticipate the exigency;

Faith is a fine invention
For gentlemen who see;
But microscopes are prudent
In an emergency.

"Science neither sings nor jokes; it neither prays nor rejoices; it neither loves nor hates"; it carries on a driving trade with facts. Yet advantages are nullified at some points. Science has discovered that arid land may be irrigated and that marsh land may be drained, but it has yet to learn that the soul of man must lie down in green pastures and be led beside the still waters. Science increases the crop yield per acre; faith restoreth the soul.

With this claim to greatness, how comes it that faith is less stressed than formerly? I take it that it is largely because, in the minds of that small but influential circle, the school men, faith has become associated, albeit unavowedly, with the naïve, if not the gullible. Not a long while back the writer had the privilege of sitting with a class of graduate students under the tutorage of an expert scientist. "But how would you define *faith*, then?" queried a student at one point of the discussion. "Open your mouth and shut your eyes and then you eat it," came the witty reply from the desk. That concept of faith has filtered down to the Philistine. He, too, looks with a little pity, if not scorn, on the man of faith, as some poor fool who chooses to go blindfold, committed either to futile undertaking or to quixotic inaction—either a Josiah who fares forth to Megiddo or a Caiaphas who forbids self-defense between the rising and the setting of the Sabbath sun. I suppose the economist would say that faith represents the unit of least utility; he would associate it with the law of steadily diminishing returns. But does not even he, nay, do not we all, as we shift into our last enterprise, make our way by

faith? Then, can one lay claim to mental integrity who takes his stand by faith in times of *Sturm und Drang*, meantime treating her as though she were the poor relation? Better no faith than the type to which one cannot give constant and proud fealty. It must be a utilitarian type if it square with the needs of the twentieth century.

The chevril faith of the Middle age—illustrated on the passive side by the saints' legends; on the active side, by the crusading movement—lessened in degree but persisted with little qualification in its main items well into the nineteenth century. It finds expression, even in late Victorian days, in what a London cynic recently labeled "Tennysonian green tea":

And yet we trust that *somehow* good
Will be the final goal of ill.

The present-day thinker gets visibly nervous at the entry of any *somehow*. He cannot "keep company," in rural parlance, with the idea that at the critical moment the hand of God will reach down to any particular area with a much-desired readjustment of circumstance. That idea has been, has it not, the main heading of popular faith? There was no room in the concept for the treatment of the world as a unit; no idea of irrevocable natural law. The faithful supported their tenets by a literal interpretation of such proof-texts as "Ask and ye shall receive," "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, believe that ye receive it and ye shall have it." Unsatisfactory outcome was charged to lack of faith, which again was attested by proof-texts, "According to your faith be it unto you," "If ye

will not believe, surely ye shall not be established."

A turning-away from this type of faith came in the nineteenth century with changed economic conditions, scientific disclosures, the growth of democracy. With new industrial conditions came new thought-forms; men asked of each other what formerly they had asked of God. With labor unions came a new meaning and administration of justice; men claimed from the state the release from oppression which formerly they had petitioned from God. Situations which half a century ago called for the exercise of faith now call for simply a press of the button. More and more, passive trust has given way to intelligent action. Temporal blessings which formerly were sought in prayer are now easily accessible by the exercise of common knowledge and common-sense. To make them subjects of prayer or to make their receipt objects of faith would be absurd. "In the earlier time, ideals were remote ends of trust and passive righteousness; for us they have become remote ends of action, something for whose realization means are intelligently sought. Wherever there is an ideal there is faith." Hence, rightly, the new psychology gives out this definition of faith: "A vital working interest in anything . . . the attitude which belongs to a live proposition and a practical plan of action."¹ The exercise of such faith involves the whole mental life—emotion, imagination, reason, and action. Religious faith is different from any other type simply by the end which it seeks. It begins at the point where religious ideals become

warm and attractive. In the language of the psychologist, "first there is an association of ideas brought to the attention by suggestion, inquiry, education, or some other chance way. These become the object of effort." Effort is dynamic and things begin to happen. "Faith, then, is just a convenient name for the forward-striving effort of human nature. It is at its best when under the control of the highest intelligence; it fulfils, in practical ways and with energy and power, the noblest ideal of the race."²

Not only is this the new analysis of faith; it is the New Faith. It is a distinct break-away from the faith of the Middle age or that of the early Modern age. It carries on no commerce with rosaries or paternosters; it knows no garth or cloistered walk or apse or chapter house; it does not "leave its protégé stranded in a sea of contemplation." It is divorced from half-lights and thin thinking.

I have called it the New Faith and have claimed that it is in part the outcome of changed social and economic conditions. Has it a remoter source? Are we passing through a renaissance? Back of the Middle age, back of the Apostolic age, back of the Apocalyptic age, we come, in the prophetism of the eighth and seventh centuries, upon a type of faith which more than suggests a source. A comparison shows striking likenesses: the faith of the earlier time and what I have termed—perhaps inaptly—the New Faith both function in the secular as well as in the religious field; both are in the active voice; both are in the present tense; if we for the

¹ Ames, *Psychology of Religious Experience*, pp. 297 ff.

² Ames, *ibid.*, pp. 300 f.

moment narrow the eighth century to Amos, we might say that both are exercised in connection with social service. In fact, to neither Amos nor Hosea would the spirit of this modern prayer (barring the adjective in the fourth line) be entirely alien:

Ever in conflict let me be;
 Make me more daring than devout;
 From sleek contentment keep me free,
 And fill me with a buoyant doubt.
 Open my eyes to visions girt
 With beauty and with wonders lit;
 But let me always see the dirt,
 And all that spawn and die in it.

Apparently, back in the eighth century, as now, faith was "a vital interest and moved on to complete itself in action." Moreover, for at least one far-seeing Semitic prophet, Amos, faith consisted in the belief that if doom is to be averted it must be through moral reform. The man of Tekoa saw life infinite only so far as it was morally significant. He recognized the faults of his time and criticized them; in so far, he rose above them. But invective is not remedy. Moral purity is not to be brought about at the drop of the hat. Amos denounced vigorously and pleaded for reform. He was concrete in this, that he demanded reform in action. In so far as he did not really bring about the reform, he was abstract. Amos was an expert surgeon, but he knew not how to nurse back to life. Hosea moved farther from action in so far as he was interested in a relation to God. Isaiah moved still farther from human initiative. For Isaiah, the entire burden of responsibility is placed upon God. Living in the very thick of things,

at the storm-center, he brings to the situation a tremendous faith, but it is calm, non-resistant, quiescent, passive. That represents his ideal program for Israel; action rests with Yahweh.

Take heed, and be quiet;
 Fear not; neither let thy heart be faint.¹

Not until a century later does faith shift in its objective from Yahweh to the individual. Then we come upon the striking point of contact with modern concepts. In Hab. 2:4 we get for the first time the suggestion of faith in "the man," a faith justified by belief in the inherent value of the individual. The righteous shall live because of his own faithfulness.

I speak out of a new and very incomplete knowledge, but this seems to me the ideal faith and the finest flower of prophetic thought. Here is faith in human nature—a faith which is the fruit of empirical knowledge, based, if you will, upon reasoning not far from inductive, a conclusion reached by one who had the temerity to challenge even Yahweh with facts. Amos had clung closely to facts; he had seen that the fruit of human endeavor was all bad, and with logical sequence he had pronounced doom, although, with Isaiah, through trust in Yahweh, he stretched his faith to encompass the salvation of a few. Habakkuk, through trust in man, expanded his faith to encompass the salvation of his entire nation. His hope for his fellow-man is founded on trust in the Yahweh-quality in the individual. Is this not in harmony with the latest theory of the psychologist and sociologist? Of all the great messages

¹ Isa. 7:4.

of prophetism, surely this is the Promethean word. It "stiffens the sinews and summons up the blood" and challenges the soul to show the mettle of its pasture. Here in ancient seventh-century prophetism lies the everlasting yea of the new psychology—*faith in the individual because inherent is a deathless godlikeness*. For Amos the claim of wage is all but zero; for Isaiah it is an unknown quantity; for Habakkuk it is raised to the tenth power. Crisis after crisis may "call" the individual but he cannot go bankrupt.

To revert to my opening thesis, this is the faith that "restoreth the soul." It is not in competition but in co-operation with science and economics, for the first step to a higher standard of living, to maximum efficiency, to adjustment, is to realize the possibility, not of God, but of God *in man*.

This concept of faith is for those who stand outside the realm of dreams and visions and ecstasy. It is for the so-called "hard-headed." It is for those who have long-distance vision—investment in human nature does not bear interest for an aeon or two. It is for the heartening of those who are busy with "a man's job."

"It was never for the mean; it requireth courage stout." Faith in an abstract God is easy enough—is it not indeed an instinct? But faith in concrete godliness *in man* is a task which taxes belief from every angle of approach. It is an intellectual type of faith and can come only to those who, looking back over the uneven history of the race, see clearly that character, despite frequent lapses, in the long run shifts to

higher levels. The wonder is that Habakkuk, with his relatively short perspective, with fate knocking at the door, with every invitation to skepticism, should have thought through the situation and pronounced the outcome not death, nor yet life through faith in Yahweh, but life through faith in man. This is the faith that not only the theologian, but the biologist, the psychologist, the student of eugenics can, nay, must, admit; otherwise he must close his laboratory doors.

II

If religious experience were reducible to one type, analysis would be a relatively easy task, but unfortunately it is not. The concept of faith which is a torch in the hand of the scientist may fail utterly to illumine the path of one whose truth has little commerce with facts. The important thing is for each to appropriate that which for him has working value. As Dr. Thomas so aptly states:

If one can get his vision of truth mystically, it is not for the scientifically minded to declare his experience invalid, and vice versa. . . . Religion will present phenomena which do not lie within the realm of scientific proof. . . . With the extra-scientific world, the faith-realm, psychology can have no dealings, either to prove or disprove.¹

We await the great psychologist who will be able to turn the X-ray upon this extra-scientific world. Meanwhile, we may at least evaluate, though we may not be able to explain, the experiences of that realm, and—if need be, in reverent ignorance—burn incense at the shrine of

¹ D. E. Thomas, *The Psychological Approach to Prophecy* (1914).

those who get their truth through mystic media.

They are the music-makers,
And they are the dreamers of dreams—
Yet they are the movers and shakers
Of the world forever, it seems.

No one has shown clearer insight in dealing with this extra-scientific realm than the late Professor James. With his unerring instinct for the inevitable term, he refers to it as the realm of "over-beliefs," and, knowing well the scorn which the statement may invite from narrow academic circles, he adds, "The most interesting and valuable things about a man are usually his over-beliefs."

In this realm we need another working definition of faith from that which served in the earlier part of this paper. Here again we turn to Professor James, who speaks of faith as "a state of confidence and trust, the central characteristic of which is absence from worry." Tolstoi accurately classifies it as one of the forces by which men live.

The faith-state may hold a minimum of intellectual content—it may be a mere vague enthusiasm, half vital, half spiritual. Or it may be associated with a very positive intellectual content, a knowledge that there is something wrong about us, coupled with the assurance that we are saved from the wrongness only by making proper connection with some higher power.¹

That Higher Power is conceived as something external, omnipotent, arbitrary, susceptible to petition, often transmitting advice and guidance by means of dreams, visions, voices, ecsta-

sies. The influence of such communications is matter of actual experience, as solid a reality as electro-magnetism. "The further limits of the individual's being plunge into an altogether other dimension of existence from the sensible and merely understandable world. Here ideal impulses originate." Yet the unseen region is not merely ideal, for it produces effects in this world. Through trust in this Higher Power effects are produced upon finite personalities. The individual receives new values; new sets of ideals; he is imbued with vigor, tone, resiliency, buoyancy, with which, in extraordinary degree, he inoculates those about him. His success in life consists in his remaining loyal to this over-belief. It pushes the frontier of his limitations far into the distance; it widens his horizon. At critical moments of need the ideal world may be depended upon to burst in upon this world of phenomena. His over-belief is his great standby. It can and will interpolate itself at any time between him and untoward circumstance. For this "good" he gives value received in trust, in devotion, and in conduct that will be acceptable to this Higher Power. Supernaturalism, is it? Yes, most assuredly. But what of that? It raises the center of personal energy; it sets eternity in men's hearts; it meets practical needs; it gives a great shove forward to the cause of righteousness; under its inspiration, the highest ethical values have emerged.

This is the typical faith (not that rarer faith which we find in Habakkuk) which meets one in the eighth- and seventh-century prophetic literature.

¹ James, Summary from *Varieties of Religious Experience*.

Faith is like every other phase of religious experience; from time to time it must be re-edited; brought up to date; reinterpreted to suit new needs; not accepted, labeled once for all, then left on the shelf, but constantly readjusted to new mental furnishings and world-views. In dealing with prophetic faith, we may abridge here, make additions there, at some points expurgate—as when we refuse to hope for interference with or stoppage of natural law; but we do well to hold, with all the power that lies in us, to the outstanding accompaniments of the faith of the prophet, namely, courage, readiness to die for an idea, devotion to God, determination to make the will of God the constitution and by-laws of our personal estate. It is by these media that the world has climbed to the table-lands.

The word faith, in its active form, can hardly be counted an Old Testament term. It occurs only twice in the English Version, once in Deut. 32:20 and again in Hab. 2:4, and in both places may be translated faithfulness. Instances of the exercise of faith, however, are manifold. The oldest are those in Judges, chaps. 7 and 8, where Gideon, through a faith which is strengthened by various tests, is emboldened to make his successful attack upon the Midianites; and in Gen. 15:6, where Abraham, contrary to all physiological law, is promised a progeny “like unto the stars” for multitude. “And he believed in Yahweh; and he reckoned it to him for righteousness.” Both episodes stand closer to myths than to fact but both illustrate the same superb attitude, namely, “All things

are possible to God.” Here is a faith which is a profound and abiding disposition, the ingrained attitude of mind and heart toward God which characterized the prophetic writers of the ninth and early eighth centuries. Faith was fundamental; it was the crowning virtue of the godly man. *Any* religion is one of faith but that of Israel is more specifically so, in that faith is its very foundation. Self-commitment to God is its very essence. It is the distinctive feature, the regulative principle which stands at the root of Israel’s religion. Professor Leuba makes this statement:

The deepest difference between Greek ethics and the religious ethics of Christianity lies not in any disagreement as to the end of conduct but in the means advocated to reach it. The first points to knowledge; the second to faith as the condition of fulfilment of the ethical ideal.¹

Probably, in the entire repertoire of antiquity, as in Christianity, no element can equal in pragmatic value the prophetic type of faith. Barring possibly love, I suppose it has supplied more inspiration and support and afforded a greater push to impulse than any other one ingredient of religious consciousness. The scorner from the cynic’s bench may call it emotional response, naïveté—what he will—but for the man in the marketplace and on the street, psycho-chemistry sounds hollow and falsetto in comparison. Does it imply reliance on the extra-human? Yes. Does it imply dependence on something on the farther side of consciousness? Yes. But it brings things to pass on the hither side, and therefore has actuality. The Hebrew prophet felt himself freed from all

¹ Leuba, “Faith,” *Journal of Religious Psychology and Education*, 1904-5.

illusion of earthly help. Hopeful waiting upon Yahweh became more and more the center of his piety.

Of what service is this prophetic type of faith today? We have already said that the items of religious experience must be rewritten and reinterpreted with successive generations. The prophetic record of faith is written in a mode and voice and tense for which today few know the rules. Moreover, running through it like a scarlet thread is the crassest sort of supernaturalism, even anthropomorphism, with utter non-sensitiveness to the hard-and-fast, immutable, physical laws which we know are not subject to disturbance. We cannot accept as factual the episodes which are used as illustrative of the prophets' faith. What are we to do with this concept of faith? The answer inevitably is, put it to the test.

I challenge even the ultra-rationalist to this laboratory experiment. Await some moment of deep discouragement, a moment when men have deceived, when, to quote dear Robert Burns, "things ha' done their damndest," when the gods have turned their wooden eye on the most conscientious and strenuous effort, when the despairing cry of the defeated soul echoes back as hollow as the unsympathetic screech of the jackal on the northern moor. Seize upon that moment and turn to the little book of Amos. Here is a man who sees upon every side the extremest form of moral obliquity, conditions which apparently cannot but work ruin. In the north, the home of vague and dreadful and overpowering terrors, looms the shadow which destruction casts. One after another, in rapid succession, nations

are collapsing. There is no discernible possibility of escape. With overwhelming facts of history to the contrary, with tremendous and agonizing difference between the numbers of the opponent and the wee group of faithful in Judah, with all possible odds against him, the prophet, driven to the last ditch, yet boldly takes his stand with Yahweh. The religion of Yahweh shall conquer. Numbers, facts, precedents, logical conclusions, go by the board; Yahweh and I shall conquer. "*Thus* saith Yahweh: As the shepherd rescueth out of the mouth of the lion two legs or a piece of an ear, so shall the children of Israel be rescued" (Amos 3:12). "Hate the evil and love the good, and establish justice in the gate; it may be that Yahweh the God of hosts will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph" (Amos 5:15).

Or stand with Elijah on Carmel and see the man of the desert, with superb irony and with a faith that is as sure and unswerving as a compass, stake all on a test in which the odds are entirely against him (I Kings, chap. 18).

Or stand with Elisha within the gates of Samaria and hear the Syrian strong men hurl their strength against the weakening walls of the capital; know that the people of the city, maddened with hunger, are correspondingly rebellious and bitter under the seer's program; remember the desperate and vindictive verdict of the king, "God do so to me, and more also, if the head of Elisha . . . shall stand on him this day," and then hear the calm, majestic, conquering voice of faith, "They that are with us are more than they that are with them" (II Kings, chap. 6).

Or stand with Isaiah in the presence of his panic-stricken king, who sees little Judah helpless before a combined attack of Syria and Israel, with Urartu and Philistia as potential allies. "And his [the king's] heart trembled, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the forest tremble with the wind." Hear the vibrant voice of faith, "Take heed and be quiet; fear not, neither let thy heart be faint" (Isa. chap. 7).

Or stand in the gate of Jerusalem and watch the mighty Assyrians, who, after yearly combats for nearly two decades, first with one, then with another, then with combinations, have put to rout Urartu and Syria and Israel and Moab and Edom and Philistia. Hear again the confident voice of faith, "He [the Assyrian king] shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, neither shall he come before it with shield. . . . By the way that he came shall he return" (Isa., chap. 37).

Is courage not yet renewed? Then stand with Micah on the streets of the very citadel of Yahwism in the last days of the eighth century. See a metropolis that is a hotbed of intrigue, a society that is undermined by indulgent immorality, a priesthood without standards, a political group which, small as it is, is divided against itself. It needs no voice come from the grave to foretell ruin. But Micah, first of the prophets to include the Holy City in the approaching doom, gives no hint of the annihilation of his race. The very center and stronghold of Yahwism, as he clearly sees, must go; the institutions of his ancient and cherished God are to be swept away. Yet serenely and with unshaken faith he places con-

fidence in a God who is great enough to win for himself glory and permanence aside from ordinary agencies. The casual reader may not appreciate the strength of a faith which could make such claim; to know what it means, one must remember how completely and intensely a localized deity was the Yahweh of the eighth-century Semite.

I challenge my hypothetical rationalist to the perusal of these and the many similar episodes from the prophetic writings. If he does not come from them "more than he was and ever ascending," he is not one with the rank and file of men. If he does not turn from them with a hitherto undreamed high potency value, with a certitude that will express itself in potent achievement, he is not as most men. I do not claim historicity for the episodes; out of a partial knowledge we should say, almost certainly they never happened; they are unthinkable. What they do is to reflect the reaction of hard-pressed souls to desperate crises; they furnish a norm for faith and hope and courage. They are doing today what they have done through the years and centuries of the past, namely, giving proof of "the fact that the conscious person is continuous with a wider self through which saving experiences come."¹ Their tremendous pragmatic value lies in this, that they bring the individual—I do not pretend to guess the *how*—to a point where he can deal with the problems of his day, as did the prophets with the problems of their day, in such manner as shall push forward the cause of righteousness. That is the great mission of this age-old faith.

¹ James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 515.